

REMARKS

The Official Action of November 28, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 11-18, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-10 have been cancelled in favor of new claims 11-18 which remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, Applicant has drafted new claims 11-18 to reflect the amended description of the claimed invention in the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 11-18 and the amended specification would clearly enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 11-18 clearly overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that

Appln. No. 10/541,122
Amdt. dated March 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2006


such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently
pertinent to warrant their applications against any of
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By


Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\bn\o\hta\FUKUMOTO3\pto\2007-03-07 Amendment.doc